DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 236 284 UD 023 170

AUTHOR Halasa, Ofelia
TITLE Reading Impact Project. Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund. Evaluation Report, 1982-83.
INSTITUTION Cleveland Public Schools, OH. Dept. of Research and Analysis.
PUB DATE Jul 83
NOTE 12p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education; Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Education; *Grade 1; Inservice Education; Parent Participation; Parent Workshops; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Reading Improvement; Reading Programs; *Remedial Reading; Teacher Aides
IDENTIFIERS Cleveland Public Schools OH

ABSTRACT

This report evaluates the 1982-83 Reading Impact Project in Cleveland, Ohio, which served 2,313 first grade pupils in 46 Chapter 1 public schools. The project utilized supervised educational aides and provided inservice education for them as well as workshops for parents. Project operations were successfully implemented, as indicated by the attainment of three objectives. Approximately 75 percent of the project participants achieved passing scores for 6 out of 10 assessment level subtests embedded in the district reading program. Eleven inservice workshops for aides were rated as effective by participants. Parents were involved through meetings and a monthly newsletter, and reported evident project effects on reading skills of children. In addition, over two-thirds of the students were expected to be promoted in September 1983, and a comparison between performance levels of blacks and whites on assessment level subtests showed only one statistically significant difference in favor of black pupils. (CMG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED236284

READING IMPACT PROJECT

DISADVANTAGED PUPIL PROGRAM FUND

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Fleming
Cleveland Public Schools

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

1982-83
EVALUATION REPORT

Prepared by

Ofelia Halasa
Project Evaluator

Typed by

Arlene Copeland

UD 023 170

Cleveland Public Schools

RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

July, 1983

READING IMPACT

1982-83 DPPF Evaluation

PURPOSE AND OVERVIEW

This project is designed to assist first grade pupils identified to have reading problems. Funding under Disadvantaged Pupil Program Funds provided for educational aides (Chapter I schools), regular inservice sessions for educational aides, regular aides supervision by the project reading consultants, and workshops for parents of participants.

Pupils selected for project services were usually identified on the basis of classroom teachers' judgement and test data. Services provided to project-eligible children by the educational aide were given under the direction of the project consultant teachers and the classroom teachers.

SERVICE SUMMARY

Pupils Served: 2,313 Grades Served: 1 Years in Operation: 12½

Schools: 46 Public Schools (See Appendix A for listing)

Staffing: Project Manager, 1 FT
Consultant Teachers, 2 FT
Educational Aides, 50 FT

Total DPPF Expenditures: *

Per Pupil Cost: *

SUMMARY

The 1982-1983 Reading Impact Project served a total of 2,313 grade one pupils at 46 Chapter I public schools. Project operations were successfully implemented, based on attainment of three objectives. Approximately 75% of a sample of project participants achieved the passing score for six out of ten Assessment Levels (4-6) subtests which are embedded in the district reading program. Almost two thirds (63%) reportedly were to be promoted to the following grade in September, 1983 and about a fifth were reportedly retained. Aides rated project inservice to be very effective. Efforts to involve parents with project activities were implemented, using parent meetings and a monthly newsletter, "Parent Tips." Parents reported evident project effects on reading skills of children. About 557 parents attended 69 meetings conducted by the project for parents.

---

*Expenditure data was not available at the time of the preparation of this report.

OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES

Assessment of the product objectives of the Reading Impact Project utilized the following procedures.

- Analysis of reading level scores of a random sample of program participants (N=306).
- Ratings of workshops by participants
- Interviews with project staff
- On-site observations of classes
- Survey of parents of participants

- Objective 1: Seventy-five percent of a random sample of first grade pupils enrolled for at least 90 days and receiving assistance from a project aide, will pass at least six of the ten subtests comprising the Department of Reading/Language Arts Levels 4-5-6 Assessment measures.

  - Outcome: This objective was attained. Analysis of test data for 256 (84%) participants with a complete set of 10 subtest scores, indicated that criterion pass scores were attained by 75% or more of the participants for six subtests (Initial Consonants, Final Consonants, Graphemic Base with Consonant Substitutes, Plural Endings, Recalling of Details and Speech Balloons).

TABLE 1

PERFORMANCE ON ASSESSMENT LEVELS 4-6 SUBTESTS (N=256)

*Assessment Subtest	No Items	Pass Score	% Pass	✓ **
1.	20	16	84%	✓
2	15	12	81%	✓
3	9	8	57%	✓
4	8	6	83%	✓
5	8	7	90%	
6	6	5	66%	
7	6	5	75%	✓
8	4	4	39%	
9	6	5	69%	
10	4	4	76%	✓

* 1-Initial Consonants 2-Final Consonants 3-Medial Vowels 4-Graphemic Base (Consonants Subs) 5-Plural Endings 6- Verb Endings 7-Recall Details 8-Main Ideas 9-Content Page 10-Speech Balloon

** ✓— Attained

The remaining 56 participants were excluded from the analysis for the following reasons: 15 identified to be "not ready", 2 with attendance problems, 4 transferees, 8 withdrawals, and 13 for a variety of "other" reasons.

- Objective 2: In-service workshops will be provided for project educational aides on a once-a-month basis.

  - Outcome: This objective was attained. A total of 11 inservice workshops were provided during the 1982-1983 school year (efer to Appendix B for listing). Staff reactions to the workshops were highly favorable based on rating forms completed by participants at the end of each workshop. Ratings based on a five-point scale (5 as Excellent to 1 as Poor), showed average ratings ranging from 4.53 to 4.95 (Excellent).

- Objective 3: Eighty percent of parents of a randomly selected sample of program participants will indicate that the project has provided information on the project activities and techniques for reinforcing children's school learning in their homes.

  - Outcome: Objective 3 was attained. Over 95% of 150 parent respondents (See Appendix C) to a questionnaire indicated that the monthly newsletter "Parent Tips" was helpful in suggesting activities to help reinforce pupil learning at home. Approximately 97% of parent respondents indicated that they were aware of the additional project assistance to their children, with variety of techniques used for notification: letters sent to homes (89%), parent visits to classroom (40%), parent-teacher conference (42%), open house (31%), and telephone calls (13%).

    Approximately 97% of parent respondents indicated positive comments made by their children about the project educational aide as noted below:

    — 79% indicated that the aide helps with developing reading skills

    — 75% indicated that the aide makes classwork in reading easier

    — about 66% indicated that the aide helps children understand what the teacher is doing

    — 61% encourages children to work harder

ADDITIONAL FINDINGS

1. One hundred sixty two (63%) of 256 pupils were reportedly promoted to the second grade while 50 (20%) were reportedly to be retained. No information was available for 44 pupils.

2. A comparison between performance levels of Black and White pupils on Assessment Levels ten subtests showed only one statistically significant difference (Content Page) in favor of Black pupils ($p < .06$). However, the difference between the two groups was so small as to be considered educationally significant (See Appendix D).

3. A total of 557 parents attended 69 project parent meetings held at different schools.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The 1982-1983 Reading Impact Project served a total of 2,313 grade one pupils at 46 Chapter I public schools. Project operations were successfully implemented, based on attainment of three objectives. Approximately 75% of a sample of project participants achieved the passing score for six out of ten Assessment Levels (4-6) subtests which are embedded in the district reading program. Over two-thirds of the youngsters reportedly were to be promoted to the following grade in September, 1983 and about a fifth were reportedly retained. Aides rated project inservice to be very effective. Efforts to involve parents with project activities were implemented, using parent meetings and monthly newsletter, "Parent Tips." Parents reported evident project effects on reading skills of children. About 557 parents attended 69 meetings conducted by the project for parents. Recommendations called for future inservice sessions for aides that will emphasize techniques for reinforcing district reading objectives.

APPENDIX A

READING IMPACT

CLEVELAND CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

1982 - 1983 School Year

Reading Impact Elementary Schools

1. Alfred A. Benesch
2. Almira
3. Anton Grdina
4. Bolton
5. Brooklawn
6. Buckeye-Woodland
7. Captain A. Roth
8. Case
9. Charles Dickens
10. Charles H. Lake
11. Chesterfield
12. Corlett
13. Denison
14. Dike
15. Charles Orr
16. East Madison
17. Euclid Park
18. Harvey Rice
19. Hazeldell
20. Henry W. Longfellow
21. Hicks
22. John W. Raper
23. Joseph Landis
24. Lafayette
25. Kenneth W. Clement
26. Louis Agassiz
27. Loius Pasteur
28. Marion Seltzer
29. Marion-Sterling
30. Miles
31. Miles Park
32. Mound
33. Mt. Auburn
34. Riverside
35. Robert Fulton
36. R.G. Jones
37. Scranton
38. Tremont
39. Iowa Maple
40. Verda Brobst
41. Wade Park
42. Waverly
43. Willow
44. William R. Harper
45. Woodland Hills
46. Moses Cleaveland

APPENDIX B

LISTING OF INSERVICE WORKSHOPS FOR EDUCATIONAL AIDES

Date	Presenter	Topic	Attendance	Mean Rating
09/09/82	Dr. John Nairus	DPPF Update	50	4.82
09/23/82	Dr. Ofelia Halasa	Evaluation 1981-1982 and 1982-1983	47	4.66
10/14/82	Mr. Philip Conway	Vocabulary Development - The Basic Sight Words	46	4.57
	Ms. Pauline Davis	The Affirmative Reading Skills Program		
11/04/82	Dr. Wanda J. Green	Competency Testing	46	4.79
	Mr. Philip Conway	Alphabet Activities		
11/18/82	Mr. Philip Conway	Demonstration of Lesson and Classroom Visitation	47	4.40
12/09/82	Ms. Estelle Holmes	Sharing Children's Literature	44	4.50
01/20/83	Mr. Philip Conway	Comprehension Skills	36	4.67
	Jane Harris	Sequence and Finding Details		
	Marie Topole	Comprehension Skills Outcomes & Conclusions		
02/17/83	Jane Harris Marie Topole	Comprehension Skills "Main Idea"	44	X
03/17/83	Jane Harris Marie Topole	Comprehension Skills "Cause & Effect"	42	X
04/26/83	Jane Harris Marie Topole	Comprehension Skills Reviewed	44	X
5/11/83	Philip Conway	Evaluation Procedures 1983 Project Records Parent Meetings Reports	47	X

[x]Rating form analysed by the Project.

APPENDIX C

PARENTS' QUESTIONNAIRE (N=150)

DPPF READING IMPACT PROJECT

1982-1983

Dear Parent:

Your child at first grade is presently receiving extra help from the Reading Educational Aide at his/her school. What do you think about the help your child is getting?

Your answer to the questions below will enable us to know your opinions. Thank you.

. Were you notified of the assistance provided to your child? Mark one answer only.

102 (97%) Yes 3 (2%) No

If yes, how was this done? Mark all the responses below that apply:

91 (89%) Letter was sent to the home

38 (37%) Open house

14 (13%) Telephone call to parent

54 (53%) Parent visit to the classroom

43 (42%) Parent-teacher scheduled conference

6 (6%) Other (specify): _____

. Were there comments made about the educational aide by your child? Mark only one answer.

118 (97%) Yes 3 (3%) No

If yes, mark the type of comments that were made. Mark all that applies at the back of this page:

93 (79%) She helps child with developing reading skills

89 (75%) She makes classwork in reading easier for child because of her help

78 (66%) She helps child understand what the teacher is doing

72 (61%) She encourages child to work harder in the class

8 (7%) Other (specify): _____

. What do you think of today's workshop? Check the appropriate column:

Question	Yes	No	Don't Know
Gives me ideas about helping my child at home	124(80%)	—	—
Helps me understand how the educational aide helps my child with reading	115(74%)	1(< 1%)	—
Ideas presented are easy to apply at home	108(70%)	—	3(2%)
Material presented are useful	108(70%)	—	1(< 1%)
I learned new things about reading	103(67%)	2(1%)	1(< 1%)
Help me understand my important role as parent to help my child learn	107(69%)	—	1(< 1%)
Discussion with other parents was good	89(57%)	2(1%)	10(7%)

. The Reading Impact monthly newsletter "Parent Tips" was helpful in suggesting activities for home reinforcement.

130(97%) Yes — No 2(1%) Don't Know

RACE	2	BLACK	889.0000	4.7796	1.6472	.133	(186)
RACE	3	WHITE	258.0000	4.3000	1.9336	.7390	(60)

TOTAL CASES = 256
MISSING CASES = 10 OR 3.9 PCT.

ASSESSMENT LEVELS TEST - IMPACT PROJECT 06/06/83 PAGE 37

CRITERION VARIABLE CNPAC

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

VARIABLE	CODE	VALUE LABEL	SUM	MEAN	STD DEV	SUM OF SQ	N
RACE	2	BLACK	889.0000	4.7796	1.6472	501.9624	(186)
RACE	3	WHITE	258.0000	4.3000	1.9336	220.6000	(60)
		WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	1147.0000	4.6626	1.7208	722.5624	(246)

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

SOURCE	SUM OF SQUARES	D.F.	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIG.
BETWEEN GROUPS	10.434	1	10.434	3.523	0.0617
WITHIN GROUPS	722.562	244	2.961		

ETA = 0.1193 ETA SQUARED = 0.0142